DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 177 SO 022 606

TITLE	The Role of the United States in a Changing World. Revised Edition. Choices for the 21st Century.
INSTITUTION	Brown Univ., Providence, RI. Center for Foreign Policy Development.
PUB DATE	Jun 92
NOTE	42p.; For earlier edition, see ED 341 603.
AVAILABLE FROM	Choices for the 21st Century Education Project, Center for Foreign Policy Development, Box 1948, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912 ($8).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Diplomatic History; Discussion; *Foreign Policy; *Futures (of Society); *Government Role; High Schools; High School Students; Instructional Materials; International Relations; Learning Activities; Political Attitudes; Political Issues; Political Power; Social Change; Social Studies; Teaching Methods; United States History; Units of Study; *World Affairs

ABSTRACT

This unit is designed to lead high school students to consider seriously the U.S. role in the world. At the core of the unit is a framework of choices for U.S. foreign policy. These choices, or Futures as they are called in the unit, are intended to be a vehicle to guide students through the process involved in developing a reasoned opinion on the U.S. role in the changing world. The unit includes a 5-day lesson plan, background reading highlighting three critical junctures in U.S. history, and a framework of four clearly defined alternative directions for future U.S. policy. In Future 1, U.S. citizens have a "good vs. evil" view of world affairs, and believe they have the right and responsibility to act unilaterally to try to help spread democracy and respect for human rights. In Future 2, citizens have a conventional "balance of power" view, and do not feel any fundamental change is needed in equity policies. In Future 3, people have a "globalist" view, and believe that all nations must address international problems not on their own, but cooperatively. In Future 4, U.S. citizens have an "economic" view, and believe that economic strength, not military strength, is the key to U.S. security and prosperity. A number of student activities also are provided, including a guide to help students to formulate a fifth, alternative Future of their own design, and materials for students to voice their opinions to political candidates, policymakers, and the media. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354177

CHOICES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SUSAN GRASECK

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Role Of The United States In A Changing World

SO 022 404

ALTERNATIVES FOR PUBLIC DEBATE AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT

A project of the Center for Foreign Policy Development

Brown University, Box 1948, Providence, RI, 02912

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Center for Foreign Policy Development

of the
Thomas J. Watson Jr. Institute for International Studies

Brown
University
Box 1948
Providence,
Rhode Island
02912

Tel: 401 863-3465
Fax: 401 274-8440
Telex: 3792135 CFPD

If education cannot help students see beyond themselves and better understand issues of national and international significance, then each new generation will remain ignorant, and its capacity to live intelligently and responsibly will be diminished.

Dr. Ernest L. Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Foreword, *Civitas: A Framework for Civic Education*

August 3, 1992

Dear Colleague:

The 1992 elections come in the wake of the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the end of the Cold War, and unprecedented international cooperation on problems as diverse as aggression in the Persian Gulf, conflict in Cambodia, and the degradation of the global environment. They also come at a time when Americans are wrestling with a sluggish economy, a serious national budget crisis, and many other pressing needs at home.

The enclosed curriculum unit, *The Role of the United States in a Changing World*, has been developed to engage your students in the vital issues facing our country. This one-week, reproducible unit will help your students consider the changes taking place in the international environment, weigh national priorities, and decide for themselves the direction that they think U.S. policy should take. This unit includes a five-day lesson plan, background reading highlighting three critical junctures in U.S. history, and a framework of four clearly defined alternative directions for future U.S. policy. The unit's approach serves to foster discussion and debate on issues on which there is neither expert nor public consensus. Your students will, in effect, grapple with the same tough questions that confront our policymakers.

The goal of this unit is to help students clarify their own ideas about the U.S. role in the world and communicate those considered opinions to our political leaders. You can give your students a voice at a time when politicians are most receptive. The unit includes a ballot for students to complete at the conclusion of the unit; return the ballot to us by September 28, and in mid-October we will tabulate the responses from classrooms across the country and send the results to political candidates, policymakers, and the media. We will also send a copy of this report to your school. We invite you, in turn, to share the results with your local candidates, officials and media.

This unit has been sent to you as a member of the National Council for the Social Studies or one of several selected state councils. We extend full permission to duplicate and distribute this unit to your students as well as to other interested colleagues. In fact, we encourage you to think of other colleagues who might wish to use it.

We hope that you will be able to join us in this critical debate on the United States' future role in a changing world.

Sincerely,

Susan Graseck
Director, Choices Education Project

BOARD OF OVERSEERS

The Honorable
Thomas J. Watson Jr.
Chair

Mark Garrison

The Honorable
Arthur A. Hartman

Artemis A. W. Joukowsky

Marie J. Langlois

Ann R. Leven

The Honorable
Charles McC. Mathias

David E. McKinney

The Honorable
Cyrus R. Vance

Olive C. Watson

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	**ii**
Note to Teachers	**iii**
Student Text:	**1-16**
Critical Junctures in U.S. Foreign Policy	**1**
Futures in Brief	**5**
Future 1: Standing Up for Human Rights and Democracy	**7**
Future 2: Charting a Stable Course	**9**
Future 3: Cooperating Globally	**11**
Future 4: Building Our Economic Strength	**13**
Glossary	**15**
Lesson Plan and Student Activities	**17**
Classroom Survey	**36**

THE CHOICES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY EDUCATION PROJECT was established at the Center for Foreign Policy Development to help citizens think constructively about foreign policy issues, to improve participatory citizenship skills, and to encourage public judgment on policy priorities.

THE CENTER FOR FOREIGN POLICY DEVELOPMENT of the Thomas J. Watson Jr. Institute for International Studies at Brown University is a non-profit research organization. Its mandate is to bring together scholars, policymakers, and the public in a search for policy choices that can lead to a consensus on U.S. national security and foreign policy.

The Study Circles Resource Center offers an abbreviated edition of this material for adult study groups. To order, write: SCRC, Box 203, Pomfret, CT 06258.

This material is also being expanded into a college text which will be available from the Dushkin Publishing Group in the fall 1992.

© Copyright April 1991. Revised June 1992, Center for Foreign Policy Development. All rights reserved. Permission is granted to duplicate and distribute with appropriate credit given. Copies may be ordered at $8.00 each. Address orders to: Choices for the 21st Century Education Project, Center for Foreign Policy Development, Box 1948, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Role of the United States in a Changing World was a collaborative effort by the Choices Project staff and the research staff of the Center for Foreign Policy Development at Brown University. We wish to thank the following researchers for their invaluable input:

Susan Eckert, *Research Associate*
Center for Foreign Policy Development

Mark Kramer, *Research Associate*
Center for Foreign Policy Development

Mark Lindeman, *Research Associate*
Center for Foreign Policy Development

Stephen Shenfield, *Research Associate*
Center for Foreign Policy Development

JoAnne Hart, *Assistant Professor of Political Science*
Brown University

William Rose, *Associate Professor of Political Science*
Connecticut College

Mike Spagat, *Assistant Professor of Economics*
Brown University

Thomas Weiss, *Associate Director*
Thomas J. Watson Jr. Institute for International Studies
Brown University

To Lorraine Walsh, editorial associate at the Center for Foreign Policy Development, we extend additional thanks for editing this curriculum unit.

Special thanks also to the three high school teachers who tested drafts of this material in their classrooms prior to publication: Antonia Andreuzzi of Brattleboro, Vermont; Candace Fisk of Springfield, Missouri; and Paula Titon of Cranston, Rhode Island.

We are grateful to have had the support of the Study Circles Resource Center, which organized two adult study groups in order to test early drafts of our futures framework. We thank Paul Aicher and Martha McCoy of the Resource Center for their helpful review of the framework as it was being developed.

The Role of the United States in a Changing World is part of a continuing series on current foreign policy issues. A new unit is published every three months during the academic year. Finally, we wish to thank The Pew Charitable Trusts, for without their financial support the series would not have come to fruition.

CHOICES

for the 21st Century Education Project

June 1992

Project Director
Susan Graseck

Curriculum Coordinator
Mark Malkasian

Project Assistant
Ashley Tucker

Staff Assistant
Anne Campau Prout

Research Assistant
Richard Chang

Staff Writer
Karl Berger

The Choices for the 21st Century Education Project is a project of the **Center for Foreign Policy Development** of the Thomas J. Watson Jr. Institute for International Studies at Brown University

Mark Garrison
Director

Richard Smoke
Research Director

Note to Teachers

The sequence of lessons in this unit is designed to lead students to seriously consider our country's role in the world. For most secondary students, this unit will represent their first encounter with the future of U.S. foreign policy. Many of the concepts will be new and the terms unfamiliar. As U.S. leaders have long known, this is a subject of great breadth and complexity, where thoughtful discussion does not come easily.

At the core of this unit is a framework of choices for U.S. foreign policy. These choices, or Futures as they are called in this unit, should be thought of as a vehicle for guiding students through the process involved in developing a reasoned opinion on the U.S. role in our changing world. By first exploring four clearly defined alternatives and the beliefs underlying them, students will be better able to organize their own values and ideas. Using the choices approach, students will begin by thinking about our country's changing role in the world, then ponder the four Futures as possible directions for U.S. foreign policy, and ultimately craft a fifth Future. This order ensures that students will acquire the tools for reflecting on U.S. foreign policy before articulating their own beliefs.

As an introductory activity to open the semester or as a culminating exercise at the end of a course, *The Role of the United States in a Changing World* aims to broaden student thinking. The Futures act to flesh out four fundamentally different ways of looking at the world, so that students can better weigh the merits of each world view. In Future 1, Americans have a "good vs. evil" view of world affairs, and believe they have the right and responsibility to act unilaterally to try to help spread democracy and respect for human rights. In Future 2, Americans have a conventional "balance of power" view, and do not feel any fundamental change is needed in our policies. In Future 3, Americans have a "globalist" view, and believe that all nations must address international problems not on their own, but cooperatively. In Future 4, Americans have an "economic" view, and believe that economic strength, not military strength, is the key to U.S. security and prosperity.

Below is an outline of a five-day lesson plan based on the choices approach. You may consider introducing the unit with a brief discussion prior to Day One. You may also find the Alternative Three-Day Lesson Plan useful. The complete lesson plan appears on pages 17-19.

Homework: Read "Critical Junctures in U.S. Foreign Policy" and complete the "Study Guide"

Day One: Thinking about the U.S. role in the world
Homework: Use the "Glossary" to complete the "Glossary Worksheet"

Days Two: The Futures before the U.S. Senate: organization and preparation
Homework: Complete preparations for the simulation

Day Three: The Futures before the U.S. Senate: debate and discussion
Homework: Read the four Futures and complete "The Futures in Perspective"

Day Four: Discussing the Futures
Homework: Complete "Focusing Your Thoughts" and "Your Future Five"

Day Five: The Futures and beyond: survey and discussion.

Student Text: The student text appears on pages 1-16. Student handouts follow the lesson plans.

Critical Junctures in U.S. Foreign Policy

Many of us tend to think of history as a seamless flow of events, with names, dates, and places merging together over the passage of time. A closer look, however, reveals the footprints of past decision-makers. At each turning point, urgent questions emerged, alternative proposals were discussed and debated, and vital decisions made. All along the way, the course of history was marked by a series of choices.

In the United States today, we are again faced with a set of critical choices. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 marked the end of more than four decades of U.S.-Soviet confrontation known as the Cold War. Without the struggle against Soviet communism as the focus of our nation's foreign policy, Americans of all opinions are again debating what our country's role in the world should be.

The following pages deal specifically with three important historical junctures when Americans grappled with similar questions. This reading assignment should prepare you for the larger task ahead: considering the future of our country's foreign policy. You will learn how conflicting values and beliefs about the U.S. role in the world shaped the development of U.S. foreign policy. Although both the United States and the world as a whole have changed enormously in the past century, you will find that many of the hopes and fears of past debates still affect the decisions we face today.

The Spanish-American War

The close of the 1800s marked the first major turning point for the position of the United States internationally. During the nineteenth century, the country had expanded across the continent and emerged as the world's leading economic power. Isolated from the Old World by two great oceans, Americans gave little thought to affairs overseas. As the United States changed, however, so did expectations about U.S. foreign policy. Many Americans believed that their country should take a more active role in world affairs. The Caribbean region, particularly the island of Cuba, held special interest.

U.S. attention was drawn to the Caribbean for a number of reasons. First, geography brought the people of the United States and the Caribbean together as neighbors. Cuba is only ninety miles away from the southern tip of Florida. As the importance of naval power increased in the 1800s, many U.S. leaders became convinced that the United States needed to control the Caribbean to protect its own shores and shipping routes. Second, the United States and the Caribbean region were linked economically. American companies invested heavily in the sugar, coffee, and banana plantations of the Caribbean, especially as plans to build a canal across the isthmus of Central America advanced in the late 1800s.

Finally, the Cuban people's struggle for independence attracted widespread American sympathy. Since the sixteenth century, Cuba had been ruled by Spain. Most Americans in the nineteenth century resented the colonial powers of Europe in general, and were particularly outraged by Spain's brutal attempts to crush the Cuban independence movement. In 1898, the conflict in Cuba led the United States to declare war on Spain.

The Spanish-American war lasted only four months and ended with a decisive U.S. victory. Military triumph, however, raised new questions for Americans. As a result of the war, the fate of Spain's colonial empire in the Caribbean and the Pacific rested in American hands. These possessions included not only Cuba and Puerto Rico, but also the distant islands of the Philippines and Guam.

Suddenly, Americans were faced with a critical choice. Since the war of independence against Great Britain, Americans had considered their country to be a foe of imperialism. Most had viewed the Spanish-American war as a struggle against the forces of European colonialism. But while opposition to imperialism was strong, so was sup port for a more prominent U.S. presence in world affairs. A new generation of policymakers felt that the United States was obliged to establish an overseas empire like the British, French, and other European powers. They argued that U.S. control over the colonies of Spain would serve U.S. military and commercial interests, and also allow the United States to promote American democratic values in foreign lands.

Many leading Americans, including writer Mark Twain and Democratic presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan, opposed U.S. rule over Spain's colonies, but President William McKinley led the campaign for annexation of the Spanish possessions. He argued that the United States had a responsibility to advance American ideals. In 1899, the U.S. Senate narrowly approved the treaty sought by McKinley.

Annexation of Spain's colonies did not put an end to debate over the U.S. role in the world. In the Philippines, U.S. troops fought to suppress Filipino nationalists from 1899 to 1902. The conflict resulted in the deaths of 4,200 Americans and 100,000-200,000 Filipinos. It also spurred protest at home. In Cuba as well, advocates of Cuban independence organized demonstrations against U.S. measures to limit self-rule. Ultimately, however, American critics of imperialism, as well as supporters of independence in the Philippines and Cuba, had little choice but to accept the more assertive international role of the United States.

World War I

The next crucial juncture in U.S. foreign policy centered on World War I. When the war broke out in Europe in August 1914, the overwhelming majority of Americans agreed that the United States should stay out of the fighting. President Woodrow Wilson established a policy of strict neutrality to avoid U.S. involvement. Like most Americans of his era, Wilson mistrusted the great powers of Europe. He believed that the United States occupied a special place in the world as a beacon of democracy, freedom, and justice. In 1914, Wilson's conception of the U.S. role in the world lay at the foundation of his policy on neutrality. By April 1917, however, Wilson evoked the same ideals in calling on Congress to declare war against Germany.

Like the Spanish-American war, World War I was a military success for the United States. Fresh American troops helped tip the balance of power in Europe against Germany, leading to an allied victory in 1918. And as in the Spanish-American war, Americans were left with vital questions about their country's role in the world once the fighting had stopped.

President Wilson was at the center of the debate that gripped the United States from 1918 to 1920. Wilson's peace proposal, known as the Fourteen Points, called for international cooperation to maintain world peace. Wilson envisioned an association of countries that would permit all nations to exercise self-rule. He imagined that the United States would join the proposed League of Nations and play a prominent part in safeguarding the peace of the new international order.

Wilson, however, underestimated the long-standing reluctance of Americans to commit their country abroad. At the heart of the debate was the proposed structure of the League of Nations. Within the treaty Wilson submitted to the U.S. Senate, League members would be required to come to the defense of any member under attack. Republican senators, the leading opponents of Wilson, argued that the United States might be compelled to fight to preserve the borders of a French colony in Africa or protect British imperial interests in India.

Rather than negotiate with his opponents in the Senate, Wilson hoped to rally public opinion behind his vision for U.S. foreign policy. In 1919, he traveled 8,000 miles by rail, giving forty speeches in twenty-nine cities during the course of a three-week speaking tour. Wilson's voice, however, was later silenced by a crippling stroke. Partially paralyzed, the President watched as the Senate in 1920 rejected U.S. membership in the League of Nations by a vote of 38-53, far short of the two-thirds majority needed to approve the treaty. One of the treaty's foes, Republican Warren G. Harding, went on to win the 1920 presidential election by pledging to return the country to "normalcy."

The bitter contest between Wilson and Republican senators turned many Americans against participation in international affairs. At the same time, the establishment of communism in the Soviet Union and the emergence of fascism in Europe added to American anxiety about threats overseas. As the prosperity of the 1920s gave way to the depression of the 1930s, many Americans sought to isolate their country from the turmoil in Europe. In the mid-1930s, for example, Congress passed a series of laws to prevent the United States from becoming caught up in another war.

World War II

The U.S. reaction to the outbreak of fighting in Europe in September 1939 closely followed the pattern of World War I. Most Americans sympathized with Great Britain and France in their struggle against Nazi Germany but viewed the war as a European matter. Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 instantly changed their attitude. The United States entered World War II with firm resolve, and mobilized its vast resources to lead the Allies to military victory in both Europe and the Pacific.

When World War II came to an end in 1945, the United States stood unrivaled as the strongest nation on earth. Unlike the combatants of Europe and Asia, the United States had escaped the devastation of war. Instead, U.S. industry had reached new levels of production during the war years, supplying much of the equipment for the Allied victory. Moreover, the United States in 1945 was the only country to possess atomic weapons.

For many Americans, however, peace represented an opportunity to again withdraw from the center stage of world affairs. With the surrender of Japan in August 1945, President Harry S. Truman moved quickly to bring U.S. troops home and allow the country's twelve million soldiers to return to civilian life. By 1947, the military had been cut to 1.4 million people.

But even as Americans were enjoying the benefits of peace, many U.S. policymakers came to recognize that World War II had fundamentally changed the international order. Great Britain, after dominating much of the globe for two centuries, was no longer able to maintain its vast empire. Likewise, the other leading European powers -- France, Germany, and Italy -- were in no position to assert themselves internationally. Most importantly, the war had strengthened the hand of the Soviet Union. In helping to defeat Nazi Germany, Soviet forces swept over Eastern Europe. They remained in place and provided the muscle behind Moscow's efforts to quickly gain control of the region. At the same time, the Soviets sought to extend their influence to Iran, Turkey, and Greece. In 1946, Winston Churchill, the British prime minister during the war, contended that the Soviets had cut off Eastern Europe from its western neighbors by dropping an "iron curtain" across the continent.

Discussion about how the United States fit into the new international order gained the attention of the American public in 1947 and 1948. The centerpiece of the national debate was a massive economic assistance program designed to rebuild Europe. Known as the Marshall Plan, the foreign aid program called for the United States to spend billions of dollars at a time when the U.S. economy was struggling to absorb millions of World War II veterans. Congress considered the Marshall Plan for ten months. At the same time, hundreds of town hall meetings were convened across the country to weigh the future of U.S. foreign policy.

The Marshall Plan was based on the belief that the United States should try to contain the expansion of Soviet communism. Following World War II, many leading policymakers in the administration of President Truman came to view conflict with the Soviet Union as inevitable. They argued that the United States should take a strong foreign policy stand to block Soviet ambitions. Truman was particularly concerned that the Soviets would promote the spread of communism in the war-ravaged countries of Western and Southern Europe.

Truman's approach, however, encountered opposition from supporters of a variety of perspectives. Traditional conservatives, for example, feared that making new commitments abroad would inflate the budget and give the military too much power. Meanwhile, many liberals believed that the Marshall Plan would divide Europe into two hostile camps and would undermine the cooperative mission of the newly formed United Nations.

To a large extent, criticisms of Truman's policies were undercut by events. In 1948, the Soviets sponsored a coup to topple the government in Czechoslovakia and imposed a blockade of West Berlin to force the Allies out of the city. Although Americans were wary of becoming entangled in international affairs, they also remembered how Nazi Germany expanded its power in the 1930s by intimidating its neighbors while the United States

watched from the sidelines. By 1948, many Americans felt that the experience of the 1930s justified a determined stance against Soviet communism.

The passage of the Marshall Plan in 1948 served as a key element in the new foreign policy of the United States. Equally important was the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949. Under the provisions of NATO, the United States, Canada, and ten countries of Western Europe pledged to come to one another's defense if any member were attacked. Although most supporters of the Marshall Plan and NATO imagined that the division of Europe into U.S. and Soviet spheres would last no more than ten or fifteen years, the Cold War between Washington and Moscow deepened in the 1950s and extended to virtually every area of the globe.

Toward the future

In the years after World War II, Americans had no way of knowing that their decisions would shape the U.S. role in the world for the four decades to follow. And yet the consensus that emerged from the national debate of 1947-48 dominated U.S. foreign policy until the power of the Soviet Union began to crumble in the late 1980s. With the breakup of the Soviet Union and new concerns coming to the forefront both at home and abroad, Americans again have an opportunity to re-evaluate our country's role in the world.

In the coming days, you will explore four alternative paths for U.S. policy over the coming decade. In each of these Futures, you will find very different conclusions about the nature of international affairs, the threats facing our country, and the role the United States should play in the world. The Futures do not serve as predictions for the year 2002. Nor do they exhaust the list of possible U.S. goals. Rather, the Futures were designed to raise fundamental issues concerning our country's course, issues that form the basis of our national debate. Together, the four Futures present a broad range of possible directions in which the United States may head over the next ten years.

Futures in Brief

Future One — Standing Up for Human Rights and Democracy

It is the year 2002. In the past ten years, Americans came to realize that as the home of freedom and democracy, the United States has a special role to play in the world. Over the past ten years, the United States followed a principled foreign policy. We militarily, economically, and politically supported the governments of the world that had both a good human rights record and the support of their people, and we opposed those that didn't. We especially supported the poor nations around the world that were taking their first steps toward democracy. At times, we may have had to use military force to stop tyrannical governments from spreading terror and misery. Now that these tyrants know that we mean business, they are causing much less trouble. In 2002, the era of the dictator is ending, and the world is becoming a safer and more humane place for all peoples.

Future Two — Charting a Stable Course

It is the year 2002. In the past ten years, Americans came to understand that as the world's superpower, the United States is looked upon by the nations of the world as an important source of stability and security. Over the past ten years, the United States carefully maintained strong political, economic, and military alliances that have made our competitive world a more stable place. This has helped prevent aggressive countries from threatening peace-loving nations and the international economy. As a result, we remain the world's superpower, and we are richer from doing business with our many allies. We sometimes had to support stable but undemocratic governments, and may even have sent some of our troops to fight again, but this was a small price to pay for keeping the aggressive governments of the world in check. In 2002, we are making the United States more powerful and the world more secure.

Future Three — Cooperating Globally

It is the year 2002. In the past ten years, Americans came to understand that they live in an interdependent and interconnected world. Over the past ten years, the United States addressed problems around the world not on its own but in cooperation with many other nations. Instead of trying to police the world ourselves, we do not use military force outside of North America unless most of our close allies and other leading nations support us in advance. We granted more responsibility to international organizations to keep the peace. Since wars and ecological destruction are often caused by economic desperation, we are now spending much more money to help the poor countries of the world get on their feet. This has been hard work, but it will make us all more secure and prosperous in the long run. In 2002, we are working together to address the common threats that concern us all.

Future Four — Building Our Economic Strength

It is the year 2002. In the past ten years, Americans came to realize that having the world's strongest economy is far more important than having the ability to serve as the world's policeman. Over the past ten years, the United States gradually brought its troops home and cut its military spending by about three-quarters. We used the hundreds of billions of dollars saved to strengthen our economy, reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and address other pressing national problems. We are still capable of defending North America, and we maintain a small force to strike quickly when Americans abroad are seriously threatened, but we are no longer a military giant. Today, our economic strength is our best weapon. In 2002, the United States is rapidly growing stronger.

Future 1

Standing Up for Human Rights and Democracy

It is the year 2002. In the past ten years, Americans came to realize that as the home of freedom and democracy, the United States has a special role to play in the world. The U.S. victory in the Gulf War, followed by the collapse of the Soviet Union, left it clear that the United States had the most powerful military on earth. We sadly realized, however, that although communism had crumbled in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, many other countries remained in the hands of cruel and undemocratic leaders who terrorized their own people and threatened their neighbors. We knew that we had to struggle until the world's bullies were stopped and all governments respected human rights and the will of their own people. Knowing that the oppressed people of the world were counting on us, we decided to act boldly.

Over the past ten years, we followed a principled foreign policy. The collapse of the Soviet Union allowed the United States to shift attention away from battling communism and instead make human rights and democracy our top foreign policy priority. We militarily, economically, and politically supported the governments of the world that had both a good human rights record and the support of their people, and opposed those that didn't. We especially supported the nations around the world that were taking their first steps toward democracy. At times, we may have had to use military force to stop tyrannical governments of this world from spreading terror and misery. Now that these tyrants know that we mean business, they are causing much less trouble. In 2002, the world is becoming a safer and more humane place for all peoples. The era of the dictator is ending.

What do we have to do?

• We will support only governments that treat all their citizens properly and that are democratically elected — or at least that clearly have the support of their people. We will make it clear to known trouble-makers, such as the leaders of Iraq, Iran, Syria, Serbia, North Korea, and Cuba, that the United States will not tolerate their cruel and aggressive ways. We will pressure China to allow its own citizens more freedom and to liberate Tibet. We will promote democracy in the former Soviet bloc. We will pressure Turkey, Israel, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines, Indonesia, and other long-time allies to improve their human rights record as well. We will encourage all countries to join us in this approach.

• Militarily, we will break our alliances with undemocratic governments or those with poor human rights records. This may mean moving our military bases from countries like Saudi Arabia or Turkey. We will stop giving or selling arms to such governments, and instead, we will supply arms only to our democratic allies that are threatened by hostile governments. We may use military force, if necessary, to prevent undemocratic countries from building nuclear, biological or chemical weapons, from supporting terrorism, or from killing their own people. We will keep our troops deployed around the world, and may use them to stop aggressive dictators from taking over their weaker neighbors or brutally repressing people within their own borders.

• Economically, we will use boycotts and sanctions against countries that support terrorism, have poor human rights records, or that try to acquire dangerous weapons. We will consider aiding rebel groups fighting for freedom and democracy. We will give economic aid to the republics of the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the developing world only if they follow democratic principles and respect human rights. We will use the promise of greater trade and aid to encourage more countries around the world to give democracy a chance, and to respect human rights.

Costs: This Future may be expensive. We may have to raise taxes, cut domestic spending, or borrow money from other countries to fund these military and economic policies. We may lose some important trading partners among undemocratic developing nations, such as Saudi Arabia and China, should we decide to stop selling them weapons or buying their products. If Western Europe and Japan join us, our costs will be reduced. In the long run, as the most dangerous governments fall from power and are replaced by humane and peace-loving ones, we may gradually reduce our military spending.

FUTURE 1 IS BASED ON THESE BELIEFS:

• The United States is respected throughout the world as the leader of freedom, justice, and democracy. As Americans, we have a special responsibility to promote democracy and respect for human rights around the world.

• We must oppose tyrannical governments everywhere. Without the checks and balances of democracy to restrain them, dictatorships are often aggressive. They are the main human cause of suffering in the world. Left unopposed, they oppress their people and may even start dangerous wars. To support them or turn a blind eye to their atrocities is dangerous and immoral. We must stop them now.

• We have the most powerful military in history and should not be afraid to use it to make the world a better place. As long as we remain militarily on our guard, we may expect fewer and fewer problems from the world's trouble-makers, and we may take bolder steps than ever before to promote democracy and respect for human rights.

CRITICS SAY:

1. The governments of the world may oppose the United States for taking this approach. They will say that we have no right to pressure other governments to act in a way that we consider just. Many will think that the United States is trying to take control of other countries.

2. In this Future, we risk losing some of our most valuable allies, such as Saudi Arabia. We also run the risk that some powerful countries may oppose us. By encouraging "good" governments to oppose "bad" ones, we may cause the world to split into two opposing sides, as in the Cold War. All of this may make the world dangerously unstable for the United States.

3. By harming our relations with undemocratic governments upon whose oil or other materials we depend, we may seriously damage our economy. We may refuse to trade with certain countries on moral grounds, but if other countries still do business with them, keeping them economically healthy, only we will suffer.

4. Some societies in developing countries may not accept our definition of democracy and human rights. For example, we may want Islamic governments in the Middle East to give their citizens the same freedoms that we have, but most of their citizens believe in their traditional way of life and may not want their society to have such freedoms.

SUPPORTERS SAY:

1. Since democracies are much less likely to start wars than dictatorships, we will be making the world a more peaceful place in the long run.

2. People around the world view the United States as the leading defender of freedom and other fundamental human rights. The collapse of communism in the former Soviet Union and the liberation of Eastern Europe has raised new hopes for the continued advance of our most cherished values. To abandon people living under tyranny who look to the United States for support in their quest for freedom would be an insult to our country's ideals.

3. If we wait until the world's bullies become so powerful that we must confront them, as we dealt with Hitler in World War II, the cost may be enormous.

4. After we help the oppressed peoples around the world throw out their corrupt leaders, the grateful new governments will want to improve economic ties with the United States. And as these new democracies take root and their economies grow strong, their citizens will have more money to purchase our products.

Future 2

Charting a Stable Course

It is the year 2002. In the past ten years, Americans came to understand that as the world's superpower, the United States is looked upon by the nations of the world as an important source of stability and security. As we entered the 1990s, we saw that the world had grown dangerously unstable. The collapse of the Soviet Union created a vacuum of power. Ethnic conflicts among new, unpredictable states threatened to engulf much of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and undermine international stability. The breakup of the Soviet Union also raised new concerns about the spread of nuclear weapons to unfriendly nations. We had already learned a lesson about the dangers of instability in the case of Iraq. With his powerful army, Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein had invaded his oil-rich but militarily weak neighbor Kuwait, and appeared ready to strike at Saudi Arabia. After defeating Iraq in the Gulf War, we realized that conflicts such as this would never have happened had we better used our influence as a superpower to make regions such as the Middle East more balanced and stable. Knowing that the situation in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe was even more explosive, we took action to make sure that nothing upset the international military balance or threatened the world economy.

Over the past ten years, the United States carefully maintained strong political, economic, and military alliances that have made our competitive world more stable. In 2002, we remain the world's superpower, and we are richer from doing business with our many allies. We sometimes had to support stable but undemocratic governments, and may even have sent troops to fight again, but this was a small price to pay for making the United States more powerful and the world more secure.

What do we have to do?

• We will continue to ally ourselves with Western Europe and Japan. We will strengthen our valuable alliances with stable developing countries, even though many, such as Saudi Arabia, are undemocratic. We will consider becoming allies with less stable but influential countries in troubled areas of the world, such as Syria in the Middle East. Our influence may make these regions more stable by helping countries there feel better protected, or by pressuring them not to start wars, support terrorism, or build nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons of their own.

• Militarily, we will promise to defend militarily weak countries, like Kuwait, which we and other industrial nations depend on for oil and a variety of important raw materials. We will promote the stability of Russia as a means of maintaining order among the republics of the former Soviet Union. We will encourage countries in troubled areas of the world to resolve their differences through negotiation. The fact that Israel and its Arab neighbors opened negotiations on their problems should serve as an example for other nations. If, however, countries in conflict cannot reach an agreement, we will give or sell arms to our allies to keep aggressive, anti-American nations such as Iraq, Libya, or Cuba, in check. We will be prepared, if necessary, to use our own troops to prevent such countries from making the world more unstable. As a result, our military will have to remain deployed around the world.

• Economically, we will not let political differences with other countries harm our important trade relationships. We will not pressure other countries to reform their governments as long as they agree not to cause trouble outside their borders or oppose our policies. We will increase our trade with and give more aid to stable governments in the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the developing world that welcome U.S. businesses, even if those governments are undemocratic or have poor human rights records. We will arm and aid rebel groups trying to overthrow their government or declare their homeland's independence from another country if we think it likely that the revolution will make the whole region more stable and that the new government will be pro-American.

Costs: We will have to maintain the world's strongest military in order to remain the world's superpower, so we may need to keep our defense spending high. If the nations of the world agree to reduce their numbers of weapons and troops, we may spend less.

FUTURE 2 IS BASED ON THESE BELIEFS:

• The United States and the whole world benefit from stability. As the crisis in the Persian Gulf showed, instability encourages aggressive nations to act up, threatens the world economy, and can plunge the world into war. Any attempt to fundamentally "change the world" will actually make the world dangerously unstable and worse off.

• Other nations depend on the United States, the world's strongest military power and one of the oldest functioning democracies, to be a source of stability and security in a rough and competitive world. More than any other country, we can maintain alliances that will keep power-hungry nations in check and make unstable countries or regions more stable.

• We must be practical, and continue to be friendly with stable but undemocratic governments, such as Saudi Arabia and China, in order to make the world more secure. In the long run, our ideals will take root in these countries, as they eventually did in parts of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

CRITICS SAY:

1. We have tried such policies in the past and they can fail. If we and other nations hadn't armed Iraq in the 1980s to keep its neighbor, Iran, in check, we wouldn't have had to fight the Gulf War later to keep Iraq in check. As World War I showed, even the most carefully arranged balances of power can eventually collapse.

2. Arranging alliances around the world was important back when we were fighting communism. But today there are no countries that seriously threaten the United States.

3. Keeping our alliances with undemocratic governments and cruel dictators sets back the cause of human rights and the worldwide movement toward democracy.

4. Many people around the world will resent the United States for trying to remain the world's military superpower. They will say that now that the Cold War is over, there is no reason for a country with only five percent of the world's population to remain so powerful.

SUPPORTERS SAY:

1. These policies will keep the United States economically powerful. By maintaining trade ties with all our stable allies among the nations of the developing world, we will secure continued access to the oil, metals, lumber, foods, and other materials that we require for our manufacturing and high living standard. In addition, we would gain new markets for our products by keeping politics from interfering with our business interests.

2. The best way to improve the quality of life for all the people of the world is through stability. A stable balance of power serves to restrain aggressive countries while reassuring weaker nations. As a result, the likelihood of war — along with destruction and human suffering — is reduced.

3. This Future accepts the world as it is. We may want to promote our democratic ideals, but most governments of the world are too self-interested to accept any kind of "new world order." The best compromise we can make is to work out alliances that make the United States prosperous and the world more secure.

4. Managing alliances against the spread of communism helped make the United States a superpower during the Cold War. Managing a set of alliances to make the world more stable will help keep us on top.

Future 3

Cooperating Globally

It is the year 2002. In the past ten years, Americans came to understand that they live in an interdependent and interconnected world. A crisis in the Persian Gulf can lead to economic problems for the United States. Our economic problems can lead to economic problems in Brazil. Economic problems in Brazil can lead to more destruction of its tropical rain forests as poor farmers clear more land for crops, which in turn creates environmental problems for the whole world. We realized that the only way to solve the many problems facing our world was for all nations to cooperate.

Over the past ten years, we addressed problems around the world not on our own but in cooperation with many other nations. Instead of trying to police the world ourselves, we do not use military force outside of North America unless most of our close allies and other leading nations support us in advance. We granted more responsibility to the United Nations and other international organizations to stop the fighting in areas torn by long-standing conflict, such as the former states of Yugoslavia and Cambodia. Since wars and ecological destruction are often caused by economic desperation, we are now spending much more money to help poor countries in the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the developing world get on their feet. This has been hard work, but improving economic conditions in these nations will make us all more secure and prosperous in the long run. In 2002, we are working together to address the common threats that concern us all.

What do we have to do?

• We will consult with other nations as we determine what our foreign policy should be. Whenever possible we will act not on our own but as part of a coordinated international effort, with the goal to make the world more secure and prosperous. We will support international boycotts and embargoes against countries such as Iraq that break international law, try to acquire nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons, or refuse to respect the rights of other nations.

• Militarily, we will not send our troops to fight outside of North America unless the fifteen-nation United Nations Security Council decides that we should. (As permanent members on the Council, the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and China must all approve.) We will work to establish a permanent UN military force ready to support the decisions of the Council with force whenever we and enough other Council nations feel this is necessary. No more than twenty percent of this international force will be composed of U.S. troops. At the same time, we will gradually reduce our number of troops around the world, with the goal of eventually having no independent U.S. forces outside of North America. We will help send specially trained international troops to troubled areas, such as the Middle East, the Balkans, the Caucasus, and the Horn of Africa, to keep the peace and encourage negotiations. We will not give or sell arms to foreign countries or rebel groups without the UN Security Council's approval, and will encourage all nations to agree to reduce their weapons and to resolve their conflicts peacefully.

• Economically, we will lead a major international cooperative campaign to find ways to improve the economic and environmental situation in the republics of the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the developing world. We will agree to forgive the billions of dollars in debt that many of them owe us. We will greatly strengthen our support of the World Bank, the UN and other organizations working on global problems, increasing by ten times our present contribution of $1.26 billion a year. Rather than use aid to pursue short-term foreign policy gains, we will join in an international effort to lift countries out of poverty throughout the world and lay the foundation for greater global harmony.

Costs: As the permanent UN rapid-deployment force becomes established, we will no longer need to remain the world's military superpower, and may greatly cut back on our military spending. While some of this money could be put to use at home, most of the money saved will be given to arming and funding our share of the UN force, and to international organizations trying to improve the economic situation in the republics of the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and among the nations of the developing world.

FUTURE 3 IS BASED ON THESE BELIEFS:

• We live in an interdependent world. A threat to one country is a threat to all countries. As a result, international organizations such as the UN have a responsibility to help address these threats. Neither the United States nor any other country has the right to decide on its own to pressure another country to behave in a certain way.

• Poverty and social injustice either aggravate or are the root causes of most conflicts around the world. Addressing these problems is more effective and less costly than sending our troops around the world to intervene when these conflicts flare up.

• Global problems such as environmental destruction and the impact of increasing numbers of refugees must be solved collectively. One country cannot decide alone how to solve these problems. The more countries work together, the better the results will be.

CRITICS SAY:

1. By handing over so much of our power to international organizations, we will lose much of the influence we have over other countries. Without our direct pressure on them, some may even turn on us. Countries will take advantage of our cooperative spirit to make themselves stronger at our expense. While we remain passive, some countries may grow more powerful than we are.

2. We should not give up our option to use military force outside of North America whenever we choose. The day may come when we want to send our troops to fight but the countries on the Security Council refuse to allow it.

3. Most countries are run by corrupt and cruel governments. Strengthening international organizations in which these tyrants have a voice, or spending billions to improve the quality of life in these countries will only make such governments stronger, and eventually cause more suffering.

4. Before we spend billions trying to solve the world's problems, with no guarantee of success, we should address the many difficult problems we face at home.

SUPPORTERS SAY:

1. The world is becoming more interdependent, not less. Global problems are posing an ever greater challenge to the nations of the world and usually do not lend themselves to military solutions. These cooperative policies allow for this trend, and better prepare us for the next century.

2. Giving more power and authority to international organizations does not make us powerless. We are the most influential member in the United Nations and other powerful international organizations, and we will continue to be. Since most nations depend upon us as a major trading partner, they will take our side when our security is threatened.

3. The economic assistance we gave Western Europe and Japan after World War II paid for itself many times over by getting these poverty-stricken countries on their feet so they could take care of themselves again. We must do the same for poverty-stricken countries today, before economic and environmental problems worsen, causing refugees to flood into the United States and Western Europe. The longer we wait, the more costly the solution.

4. Cooperating globally is only fair. The earth does not belong to us. Americans comprise only five percent of the world's population, and the United States is but one of more than 185 countries in the world. We have no right to deploy our massive armies or start wars around the world without first seeking international approval.

Future 4

Building Our Economic Strength

It is the year 2002. In the past ten years, Americans came to realize that having the world's strongest economy is far more important than having the ability to serve as the world's policeman. After World War II, the great military strength of the United States helped make it a superpower. But by the time the Cold War ended, the world had changed. While we spent billions of dollars a year defending countries, such as Japan and Germany, that could easily afford to defend themselves, those countries were pulling ahead of us economically and becoming more powerful than we were. We found ourselves so bogged down militarily around the world that we couldn't afford to deal with the biggest threats facing us in the 1990s: our weakening economy and lack of economic competitiveness, the national debt, decaying inner cities, crime, drugs, AIDS, pollution, and homelessness. We knew that if we did not change with the times, we would become a second-rate nation.

Over the past ten years, we gradually gave up our role as global policeman and cut our military spending by about three-quarters. We used the hundreds of billions of dollars saved to strengthen our economy, improve our energy self-sufficiency, and address other pressing national problems. We are still capable of defending North America, and we maintain a small force to strike quickly when Americans abroad are seriously threatened, but we are no longer a military giant. Today, our economic strength is our best weapon. In 2002, the United States is rapidly growing stronger.

What do we have to do?

• We will make building our economic strength our nation's first priority. However, we will not isolate ourselves politically or economically from the rest of world. We will use our regained economic influence to pressure the governments of the world to act in ways that will both ensure our security and prosperity and make the world more peaceful and prosperous.

• Militarily, we will gradually phase out our alliances around the world, except with Canada, Mexico and the Caribbean nations. The United States will make it clear that it will only join other countries militarily when it feels its security is directly threatened. We will redesign our armed forces to defend only the United States, Canada, Mexico and the Caribbean, and will maintain a small number of troops ready to respond around the world when American lives are at stake (for example, during a hostage crisis, or to evacuate Americans from a hostile country). These steps will allow the United States to gradually cut its military budget by about three-quarters.

• Economically, we will redirect the hundreds of billions of dollars cut from our military budget to strengthen the economy. We may use the money saved to cut taxes, trim our national deficit, invest in education and industry, repair our roads and bridges, and improve technological research in non-military products. We may also spend more money on addressing national problems such as homelessness, drug abuse, crime, pollution, and AIDS, or the problems facing single parents and the elderly. We will push to reduce greatly our dependence on foreign oil. As we scale down our military, we would rely more on foreign aid, boycotts, sanctions, and other non-military pressure as our main tools to make the United States secure. We will improve our trade ties around the world in order to strengthen our economy even more and build our economic influence.

Costs: This Future will allow us to cut our military budget by about three-quarters, which will eventually free up over $200 billion dollars every year. We will redirect this money toward strengthening our economy and better addressing our domestic problems.

FUTURE 4 IS BASED ON THESE BELIEFS:

• In the post-Cold War era, economic power is far more important than military power. Consequently, we should spend much more money on strengthening our economy and much less on our military. We must not let Germany, Japan, or any other country gain an economic edge over us.

• We no longer need a massive army to protect ourselves adequately. We can easily defend North America from attack with far fewer troops than we now have. Our best tool for defending ourselves and exercising international influence is our economic power.

• The greatest threats facing the United States today are at home: our weak economy, our national debt, our decaying cities, crime, drugs, homelessness, and other long-neglected domestic problems. To remain strong as a nation, we must face them.

CRITICS SAY:

1. Withdrawing our military forces will make the world dangerously unstable. Pulling our troops out of Europe, the Middle East, and Asia may upset the military balances there and spark wars as aggressive nations move to fill the vacuum. The nations of the world will lose confidence in the United States.

2. We will be throwing away our option to use massive military force outside of North America to stand up for democracy or protect our economic interests.

3. After winning the Cold War, we would be foolish not to actively promote democracy and stability in the republics of the former Soviet Union. This region is too chaotic and possesses too many destructive weapons to ignore.

4. The Gulf War showed us that economic power has its limits, and that military strength is still a decisive factor in shaping the world. If we sharply cut our military spending, we may be unable to defeat the next Saddam Hussein that crosses us.

SUPPORTERS SAY:

1. As we build our economic strength, we will become more powerful in the world, not less. In recent decades, Japan and Germany have gained leading roles in the world economy without spending heavily on the military.

2. It's time to reap the fruits of our victories in the Cold War and the Gulf War. Now that there are no major military threats facing us or any of our allies, it's time to beat most of our swords into plowshares. Our allies can now easily afford to defend themselves.

3. Once we build up our economic strength, we will be in a much better position to serve as model for other countries. If all countries follow our example and slash their military budgets, there will be far less war and suffering overall.

4. If we don't address pressing domestic problems soon, we run the risk that we too will come out losers in the Cold War, with our economy dragging and our cities in decline.

Glossary

alliance: An agreement among nations, often to protect each other in case of attack. The United States has agreed to help protect Canada, Japan, Israel, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines, Turkey, Indonesia, most of the countries of Western Europe and Latin America, and many other countries. Of more than two million Americans in the U.S. armed services, more than 425,000 are stationed in Western Europe, Japan, South Korea, the Persian Gulf, and in other countries that are U.S. allies.

arms control agreements: Agreements in which two or more countries reduce their numbers of weapons or set limits on how many more weapons they can have.

boycott: A refusal to deal with a nation or organization. One country or group of countries may refuse to buy the products of another country in order to force it to change its policies. The United States boycotts products made in Cuba, Vietnam, Libya, and Iraq and other countries because it opposes their governments.

democracy: A system in which citizens control their government by electing representatives. Most allies of the United States are democracies, but some, such as Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, are not. A number of weak democratic countries have poor human rights records.

developing nations: Most of the countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, including Mexico, China, and Brazil. Since they have little modern industry, their economies are considered "developing." About three-quarters of the people on earth live in developing countries. Most citizens of these countries are extremely poor. Since 1945, the majority of the world's wars and violent conflicts have occurred in developing nations.

dictatorship: A system in which citizens have no power and the government is controlled by an undemocratic leader, or dictator. Dictatorships, such as Iraq, Syria, and Cuba, generally have poor human rights records.

foreign aid: Assistance given by one country to another. In the 1992 fiscal year, the United States is expected to spend ten billion dollars on aid to other countries in weapons, food, farming equipment, and money to strengthen their militaries and improve their economies. Another possible form of aid is for a rich country to forgive the money that a poor country owes it.

former Soviet bloc: The former Soviet Union and its allies in Eastern Europe. Under the domination of the Soviet Union, these countries worked together as trading partners and military allies for four decades after World War II. The Soviet bloc was viewed as the leading security threat to the United States and its allies. Since the collapse of communism, countries of the former Soviet bloc have sought aid from the United States to help them move from communism to free-market economics.

global environmental problems: Environmental problems that affect the entire planet. Although air and water pollution are often thought of as local or regional problems, scientists have come to recognize that the overall health of the planet may be threatened by man-made changes to the environment. Concern about global warming, depletion of the ozone layer, and other global environmental problems drew representatives from 178 countries to the UN-sponsored Earth Summit in June 1992.

human rights: Basic moral standards that establish individual liberties and freedoms which are protected from control by the states and other groups. The authors of the Declaration of Independence considered "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" to be fundamental human rights. Governments that murder, torture, or abuse their citizens, or imprison them without a fair trial, have poor human rights records. Dictatorships, like Syria and Cuba, generally have poor human rights records, but so do a number of democracies, like Israel, Turkey and the Philippines.

international organizations: Organizations in which nations work together to achieve a common goal. The United Nations was designed to promote peace and provides a forum for countries to discuss and organize action on global issues. The World Bank loans money to poor countries. Each year the United States gives $1.26 billion to help support such organizations.

interdependence: Being dependent upon each other. Countries are interdependent when they cannot meet all their needs on their own. For example, Japan is dependent on the Middle East for oil. The Middle East is dependent on the United States for oil drilling equipment. The United States is dependent on Japan for a variety of important high-tech equipment.

Middle East: A region including the countries of southwestern Asia and northeastern Africa. Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Syria, Libya, and Lebanon are some of the countries in the Middle East.

national budget: The money a country plans to spend each year. The estimated U.S. budget for fiscal year 1992 is $1.475 trillion, or $1,475 billion. In the 1992 fiscal year, our federal government is expected to spend an estimated $307 billion on defense, $287 billion on social security, $196 billion on help for the poor and unemployed, $213 billion on Medicaid, Medicare, and other health programs, $45 billion on education, $34 billion on transportation, and $17 billion on foreign aid, international organizations, and diplomacy.

national budget deficit: The amount of money a government owes if it spends more money than it takes in. In the 1991 fiscal year, the U.S. government spent $269 billion more than it had collected (mainly through taxes) by borrowing the money from investors in the United States and abroad. The deficit for fiscal year 1992 is expected to be $399 billion. Over the years, deficit spending has created a national debt of nearly $4 trillion ($4,000 billion), making us the largest debtor nation in the world. In the fiscal year 1992, the United States is expected to pay $207 billion in interest on the debt.

nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons: Nuclear weapons are the most powerful weapons ever made, creating massive explosions and long-lasting, deadly after-effects. Biological weapons spread deadly diseases. Chemical weapons poison their victims. In 1988, Iraq's dictator Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons against his Kurdish citizens. Because of their enormous destructive potential, the United States has sought to control the spread of these types of weapons.

sanctions: A non-military action taken by one or more nations to force another nation to behave in a certain way. Sanctions include boycotts and the denial of loans. For example, when Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the United States and other countries imposed strong economic sanctions by stopping Iraq from trading with other countries. In the past, the United States has imposed milder trade sanctions against the Soviet Union, China, and South Africa, and continues to maintain sanctions against North Korea, Libya, Cuba, Serbia, Iran, and Vietnam, as well as Iraq.

superpower: A country that is far more powerful than other countries. Because they could project their forces around the world, people referred to both the United States and the Soviet Union as superpowers. Due to severe economic problems, Russia is not considered a superpower. Other countries that are leading powers, but not referred to as superpowers, are China, Japan, Germany, Great Britain, and France.

trade: The act of buying and selling goods. The United States and U.S. businesses trade with most countries of the world, selling machinery, food, airplanes, and other products, and buying oil, electronic goods, clothing and other products. The three leading trading partners of the United States are Canada, Japan, and Mexico. In recent years, Americans have bought more than they have sold, and this has harmed our economy. In 1990, the U.S. trade deficit was $101 billion.

rebel groups: People that have organized to fight to overthrow their country's government. In the 1980s, the United States supplied weapons and other aid to rebel groups fighting in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, and Cambodia.

wars: Large-scale, armed conflicts among countries or groups of people in a country. Unlike the Gulf War, most wars around the world since World War II have been civil wars or wars for independence, and have been fought mostly in developing nations. Sudan, Sri Lanka, and the former republics of Yugoslavia are among the nations currently torn by civil wars.

Five-Day Lesson Plan

Optional Activity: To focus student attention on the momentous changes in the international environment, ask them to identify the most important developments in world affairs over the past three or four years. Record the responses on the chalkboard. Ask students how these events have affected the role of the United States in the world. How do American attitudes toward foreign policy today differ from those of five or ten years ago? Compare the discussion of foreign policy issues in the 1988 and 1992 presidential campaigns. What accounts for the shift in emphasis?

Homework: The night before the Day One lesson, students should read "Critical Junctures in U.S. Foreign Policy" and complete the "Study Guide" to prepare for the Day One activity.

DAY ONE

Thinking about the U.S. role in the world

Objective: This brainstorming activity encourages students to compare and contrast the forces shaping the current debate on the U.S. role in the world with issues that arose during critical junctures of the past.

1. Call on students to focus their attention on 1947, the year when Secretary of State George Marshall first proposed that the United States should provide billions of dollars in aid to Europe. Ask students to identify the leading threats that faced the United States at the time. On the positive side, what hopes did Americans hold for the future of the world? What lessons from history were uppermost in the minds of Americans? Record student responses to these three questions on the chalkboard.

2. Ask students to consider the relationship between the threats and hopes of 1947 and U.S. foreign policy. For example, what kind of foreign policy would derive from a fear of Soviet expansion? How would a supporter of global cooperation shape the U.S. role in the world? Call on students to suggest three or four well-defined policy options for the United States in 1947. Emphasize that each option should respond to a distinct set of threats and hopes. After students have brainstormed a set of options for 1947, ask them to consider the options available to the United States at the turn of the century and after World War I. How did the debate about U.S. foreign policy during those earlier periods differ from the discussion following World War II?

3. Distribute "Futures in Brief." Explain that the Futures present four different directions for the course of U.S. foreign policy over the next decade. Ask students to review the threats and hopes of 1947. How have they changed over the past forty-five years? How do the Futures of today compare to the options of 1947? 1918-20? 1898-99? What lessons from the past are most relevant to the current debate on the U.S. role in the world?

Homework: Students should use the "Glossary" to complete the "Glossary Worksheet."

DAY TWO

The Futures before the U.S. Senate: organization and preparation

Objective: This two-day simulation will familiarize students with the underlying values and beliefs shaping the debate on U.S. foreign policy as they analyze, advocate, and critique the four Futures.

1. Inform students that they will participate in a simulation using the Futures and background reading.

Form four groups of three to four students. Assign a Future to each group. The remainder of the class will serve as members of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee. (In smaller classes, other teachers or administrators may be invited to serve as committee members.)

2. Distribute "Presenting Your Future" to the four Future groups and "The U.S. Role in the World" to the committee members. Inform students that each Future group will be called upon in Day Three to present the case for its assigned Future to the Foreign Relations Committee. Explain that Future groups should follow the instructions in "Presenting Your Future." Note that the Future groups should begin by assigning each member a role. (As an extra challenge, ask the groups to design a poster illustrating the best case for their Future.) While the Future groups are preparing for their presentation, members of the Foreign Relations Committee should develop cross-examination questions for Day Three (see "The U.S. Role in the World").

Homework: Students should complete preparations for the simulation.

DAY THREE

The Futures before the U.S. Senate: debate and discussion

1. Organize the room so that the four Future groups face a row of desks reserved for Foreign Relations Committee members. Explain that the simulation will begin with three-to-five minute presentations by the spokespersons of the Future groups. Encourage spokespersons to speak clearly and convincingly.

2. Following the presentations, invite members of the Foreign Relations Committee to ask cross-examination questions. Make sure that each committee member has an opportunity to ask at least one question. The questions should be evenly distributed among all four Future groups. If time permits, encourage members of the Future groups to challenge the positions of the other groups. During cross-examination, allow any Future group member to respond. As an alternative approach, permit cross-examination following the presentation of each Future.

3. Instruct members of the Foreign Relations Committee to fill out the first part of their "Evaluation Form" during the course of the period. The second part of the worksheet should be completed as homework.

Homework: Students read the four Futures and complete "The Futures in Perspective."

DAY FOUR

Discussing the Futures

Objective: This discussion activity will deepen student understanding of the Futures in the context of current international events.

1. Call on members of the Foreign Relations Committee to share their evaluations of the Future groups. Which arguments were most convincing? Which beliefs were most appealing? Which lessons from history were most relevant to the debate?

2. Review student responses to "The Futures in Perspective." Make sure that students understand the key philosophical distinctions among the Futures. Which Futures advocate an activist U.S. role in world affairs? Which Futures favor less involvement? Which Futures are most protective of national sovereignty? Which Futures are supportive of a more multinational approach? How do the Futures balance idealism and pragmatism?

3. Call on students to respond to a current event through the perspective of the Futures. For example, what do the Futures recommend for U.S. policy regarding ethnic conflicts that have emerged in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union? How should the U.S. respond to threats associated with the development of nuclear weapons in North Korea, Iraq, and elsewhere?

Homework: Students should complete "Focusing Your Thoughts" and "Your Future Five."

DAY FIVE

The Futures and beyond: survey and discussion

Objective: This exercise will allow students to probe the values and concerns underlying the views of the class on the U.S. role in the world.

1. Review the beliefs section in "Focusing Your Thoughts," inviting students to defend beliefs they found most appealing. Call on students to explain how their beliefs guided their responses to "Your Future Five."

2. Inform students that they will be taking part in a survey on the attitudes of high school students regarding the direction of U.S. foreign policy. Explain that their responses will be tabulated along with those of other students using *The Role of the United States in a Changing World* to form a nationwide picture of student opinion. Distribute "Classroom Survey: Policies and Tradeoffs" and ask students to complete the survey individually. After students finish the assignment, call on them to indicate their responses with a show of hands. Record student responses on the "Classroom Reporting Form." (To participate in the nationwide poll, reporting forms and student surveys should be sent to the Center for Foreign Policy Development by September 28, 1992.)

3. Call on students to analyze the views of the classroom. Which events in the past three or four years have left the greatest impact on student attitudes? What lessons from history have been most important in shaping student opinions? Finally, how would the responses of the class likely differ from a survey of Americans nationwide? What factors (e.g., age, region, class, religious or ethnic background, local economic conditions, etc.) would account for the differences?

4. *Extra Challenge:* As homework, instruct students to write a letter based on their Future to a presidential candidate, the editor of a local newspaper, or a member of Congress. Suggest that students analyze the results of the classroom survey and then explain the beliefs and policy recommendations of their own Future Five. Encourage students to illustrate how their Future would address current problems and concerns.

Alternative Three-Day Lesson Plan

DAY ONE: See Day One of the Five-Day Lesson Plan.

DAY TWO: Form the class into groups of four students. Assign each group member one of the four Futures. Call on students to evaluate the risks and tradeoffs of their assigned Future. Ask students to respond to a current event through the perspective of their assigned Future. (See the third part of Day Four.) Moving beyond the current event, ask students to comment on what they find most appealing and least appealing about each of the Futures. What historical lessons can be applied in evaluating the Futures? Ask students to imagine they were advising the President on the future direction of U.S. foreign policy. How would they assess each of the Futures? Students should complete "Focusing Your Thoughts" and "Your Future Five" as homework.

DAY THREE: See Day Five of the Five-Day Lesson Plan.

Suggested Topics for Further Discussion

After your class completes its work with the Futures, you may consider further employing the varying perspectives presented by the Futures to enter into follow-up discussions on the nature of the United States, Americans, and world affairs. These may also be assigned as essay topics. Students should know that these are not easy questions, and they have no "right" answers. Below are some suggested topics:

What are our most important values? Our belief in freedom, justice and democracy? Our pragmatism? Our visionary idealism and belief in equality? Our self-reliance and competitiveness?

Are Americans special? What makes the United States unique? Do the United States' special qualities give it a right or responsibility to pressure other countries to behave in a certain way? Are we entitled to any special privileges because of our enormous economic and military power?

How well can we tell right from wrong? Do we have the right to take action in the world when we believe another country is doing something that is wrong, even when other countries do not agree with us? When, if at all, should we refrain from acting unless other countries support us? Has the United States ever acted wrongly?

Must our means be as good as our ends in making the world a better place? Can we make the world a better place by sometimes allying with dictators? Consider the history of our involvement in Latin America, and our alliances in World War II, the Vietnam War, and the Gulf War.

Where is our country headed in the next century? What new problems might Americans have to face in the next century? Will our role in the world be different?

How does the world work? Do we live in a world of good and evil, in which we should fight injustice whenever we see it? Do we live in a world of power, in which we should constantly try to remain powerful and balance other competing powers against each other? Is the world fundamentally interdependent, so that we all must sink or swim together? Or does money make the world go around, and is military strength becoming obsolete in the nuclear age?

Where is the world headed in the next century? Will democratic ideals take hold of the whole world, or will countries turn to dictators in times of trouble? Will war become obsolete, or will the proliferation of weapons increase conflict? Will increasing interdependence dissolve the nation-state and lead to world government, or will nations become more protective of their sovereignty? Will the way we think about the world fundamentally change, or will our outlook remain basically the same?

How does one define "peace among nations"? Is it when there is no armed conflict among states? Is it when all governments respect the will of their people and international law? Is it when all countries have stable governments and no country feels gravely threatened by another? Is it when countries no longer compete with one another? Is it when nations reach an understanding that wars are not worth fighting?

What is "human nature"? Do all people around the world want the same freedoms and democratic system that we have? Are humans naturally competitive or cooperative? What leads people to support undemocratic leaders or fight wars?

Name: _____

Study Guide

1. Why did U.S. interest in the Caribbean region grow during the late 1800s?

2. Why is the period after the Spanish-American war considered a critical turning point in U.S. foreign policy?

3. Why did the debate about the U.S. role in the world in 1919-20 focus on the question of U.S. membership in the League of Nations?

4. How would U.S. foreign policy in the 1920s have been different if Woodrow Wilson's viewpoint had been adopted?

5. Why did many Americans believe that the United States could not withdraw from world affairs after World War II?

6. In what ways did U.S. foreign policy during the Cold War represent a sharp break from the past?

Name: _____

Glossary Worksheet

Instructions: Match the terms in Column B with the items in Column A.

Column A

___ Source of much of the world's oil

___U.S. political system

___Included $307 billion for defense

___U.S. wheat in exchange for Mexican oil

___Most dangerous weapons

___Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty signed by Americans and Soviets

___Supported by United States in Afghanistan

___Since World War II, most have taken place in developing countries

___U.S. ban on trade with Cuba

___Communists controlled governments here

___Defense treaty between United States and Japan

___United States and other countries applied these to block Iraq's trade

___Murder and torture are violations

___$10 billion in annual U.S. assistance

___Describes link between Japan, Middle East, and United States

___Country with enormous global power

___Totaled $269 billion in the 1991 fiscal year

___Ozone depletion is example

___Iraq's political system

___World Bank and United Nations

___Where three-quarters of the world's people live

Column B

A. alliance

B. arms control agreement

C. boycott

D. democracy

E. developing nations

F. dictatorship

G. foreign aid

H. former Soviet bloc

I. global environmental problems

J. human rights

K. international organizations

L. interdependence

M. Middle East

N. U.S. national budget for the 1992 fiscal year (estimate)

O. U.S. national budget deficit

P. nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons

Q. sanctions

R. superpower

S. trade

T. rebel groups

U. wars

Presenting Your Future

U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearings

Day One — Preparing Your Presentation

Your assignment: Your group has been called up to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate to explain why your Future should serve as the basis of our country's foreign policy over the next decade. You will be judged on how persuasively you present your Future.

Organizing your group: Each of the four members of your group will take a specific role. Below is a brief explanation of the responsibilities for each role:

1. *Spokesperson:* Your job is to explain why the Future of your group is best for the United States, in a three-to-five minute presentation to the Foreign Relations Committee. In preparing your presentation, you will receive help from the other members of your group. You should include arguments from their areas of expertise. Keep in mind, though, that you are expected to take the lead in organizing your group. Read your Future and review "Critical Junctures in U.S. Foreign Policy" to build a strong case for your Future.

2. *Foreign Policy Adviser:* Your job is to advise the spokesperson of your group on how your Future will address overall U.S foreign policy concerns. Concentrate your efforts on exploring your Future's response to the leading threats and problems facing the United States. Base your arguments on current events wherever possible. You should also review "Critical Junctures in U.S. Foreign Policy" to find historical evidence to support the policies of your Future.

3. *Military Expert:* Your job is to advise the spokesperson of your group on the military policies of your Future. Pay special attention to the second paragraph of the "What would we have to do?" section of your Future. Review "Critical Junctures in U.S. Foreign Policy" to find historical evidence to support the policies of your Future. You should also consider recent events, especially the collapse of the Soviet Union, the lessons of the Gulf War, and the budget deficit here at home in developing your arguments.

4. *Economics Expert:* Your job is to advise the spokesperson of your group on the economic policies of your Future. Pay special attention to the third paragraph of the "What would we have to do?" section of your Future. Review "Critical Junctures in U.S. Foreign Policy" to find historical evidence to support the policies of your Future. You should also consider recent events, especially the issue of economic aid to the republics of the former Soviet Union, the economic sanctions that have been imposed on Iraq since August 1990, and economic conditions in the United States.

Day Two — Making Your Case

On Day Two, your spokesperson will deliver a three-to-five minute presentation to the Foreign Relations Committee. Notes can be used, but the spokesperson should speak clearly and convincingly. During the other presentations, you should take notes to prepare challenging cross-examination questions. After all of the groups have presented their options, members of the Foreign Relations Committee will have the first opportunity to ask cross-examination questions. Any member of your group may respond during the cross-examination period. If time permits, your teacher may also allow you to challenge other option groups with your cross-examination questions.

The U.S. Role in the World

U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee Members

Your Role

You are a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate. Your committee oversees the foreign policy of our country. In the past few years, many of our long-standing assumptions about the world have changed. The U.S. role in the world must keep up with those changes. In this exercise, you will hear four different views on the future direction of our country's foreign policy.

Your Assignment

You must decide which of the four groups presents its Future most effectively. While the Future groups organize their presentations, you should prepare questions about the Futures. After the Future groups give their presentations, you will have an opportunity to ask questions during a cross-examination period. You should prepare two questions for each of the Futures. Your questions should be challenging and critical. For example, a good question for Future One might be:

> *Wouldn't Future 1 put us in conflict with some of our most important economic and military allies, such as Saudi Arabia?*

Examine the "Critics say" section under each of the four Futures for ideas in developing questions. Your should also review "Critical Junctures in U.S. Foreign Policy" to analyze the Futures from a historical perspective. You may work on your questions with another member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Your teacher will collect the questions at the end of the exercise.

The "Evaluation Form" is designed for you to record your impressions of the Future groups. Part I should be filled out in class after the Future groups make their presentations. Part II should be completed as homework. After this activity is concluded, you may be called upon to explain your evaluation of the Future groups.

Center for Foreign Policy Development *Permission granted for duplication*

Name: _____

Evaluation Form

U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee Members

Part I

What was the most persuasive argument presented in favor of this Future?	What was the most persuasive criticism presented against this Future?
Future 1	*Future 1*
Future 2	*Future 2*
Future 3	*Future 3*
Future 4	*Future 4*

Part II

Which group presented its Future most effectively? Explain your answer.

Center for Foreign Policy Development *Permission granted for duplication*

The Futures in Perspective — Teacher's Guide

	Future 1	*Future 2*	*Future 3*	*Future 4*
What is the greatest threat facing the United States?	Aggressive dictatorships present the greatest threat to the United States. Ruthless tyrants not only terrorize their own people but strive to expand their power at the expense of their neighbors by building up dangerous military machines.	International instability presents the greatest threat to the United States. In a world on the brink of chaos, sudden changes in the international order may upset the world's economy and plunge still more countries into conflict, even nuclear war.	Global economic and environmental problems present the greatest threat to the United States. The growing interdependence of the planet means that Americans cannot escape the effects of poverty and conflict in other countries.	The decline of our economic and social health presents the greatest threat to the United States. Our weak economy, national debt, decaying cities, crime, drugs, and homelessness endanger our national security more than any problem abroad.
What should we learn from the Cold War?	The Cold War showed that U.S. resolve and commitment are capable of defeating the forces opposed to human rights and democracy.	The Cold War showed that cautious diplomacy, even with our enemies, maintains stability and prevents war between military superpowers.	The Cold War showed that competition for world domination sparks wars and conflict throughout the globe.	The Cold War showed that placing foreign affairs at the top of our priorities results in the neglect of problems affecting Americans here at home.
What principles should guide our policy on economic aid to developing countries?	We should give aid only to countries that uphold human rights and democracy within their own borders.	We should give aid to countries that are willing to serve U.S. foreign policy interests.	We should give greater amounts of aid to international organizations to help lift poor countries all over the world out of poverty and to address environmental problems.	We should give less aid abroad and redirect the money toward solving problems here at home.
What should be the U.S. role in Europe?	The United States should play a leading role in Europe in order to guide the former Soviet bloc countries toward democracy and human rights.	The United States should maintain alliances with the leading nations of Western Europe while inviting Russia to help us in promoting the stability of the region.	The United States should move away from its leadership role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and instead cooperate to address the problems of the former Soviet bloc and other struggling nations.	The United States should withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), limit aid to the former Soviet bloc, and direct the money saved to problems at home.

Instructions: Fill in the blank boxes with answers appropriate to the Futures.

The Futures in Perspective

	Future 1	*Future 2*	*Future 3*	*Future 4*
What is the greatest threat facing the United States?	Aggressive dictatorships present the greatest threat to the United States. Ruthless tyrants not only terrorize their own people but strive to expand their power at the expense of their neighbors by building up dangerous military machines.	International instability presents the greatest threat to the United States. In a world on the brink of chaos, sudden changes in the international order may upset the world's economy and plunge still more countries into conflict, even nuclear war.	Global economic and environmental problems present the greatest threat to the United States. The growing interdependence of the planet means that Americans cannot escape the effects of poverty and conflict in other countries.	The decline of our economic and social health presents the greatest threat to the United States. Our weak economy, national debt, decaying cities, crime, drugs, and homelessness endanger our national security more than any problem abroad.
What should we learn from the Cold War?	The Cold War showed that U.S. resolve and commitment are capable of defeating the forces opposed to human rights and democracy.		The Cold War showed that competition for world domination sparks wars and conflict throughout the globe.	
What principles should guide our policy on economic aid to developing countries?		We should give aid to countries that are willing to serve U.S. foreign policy interests.		We should give less aid abroad and redirect the money toward solving problems here at home.
What should be the U.S. role in Europe?	The United States should play a leading role in Europe in order to guide the former Soviet bloc countries toward democracy and human rights.	The United States should maintain alliances with the leading nations of Western Europe while inviting Russia to help us in promoting the stability of the region.		

Focusing Your Thoughts

Ranking the Four Futures

Imagine you are a White House adviser and the President wants your opinion on which Future the United States should follow. Rank the Futures, with "1" being the best Future our country should follow, "2" being the second best policy, etc.

___ **Future 1: Standing Up for Human Rights and Democracy**

___ **Future 2: Charting a Stable Course**

___ **Future 3: Cooperating Globally**

___ **Future 4: Building Our Economic Strength**

Beliefs

What do you think of these statements? Rate each of them:

1 = Strongly Support
2 = Support
3 = Oppose
4 = Strongly Oppose
5 = Undecided

___ Poverty and war in faraway countries threaten our own future.

___ We will always have to compete with the world's other nations for power.

___ It is wrong for us to do business with undemocratic governments that have poor human rights records, no matter how important it is for our economy.

___ The greatest threats facing our country are all at home: a weak economy, budget deficits, crime, drugs, poverty, AIDS, and homelessness.

___ We have no right to decide on our own to pressure another country to behave in a certain way.

___ Using our military around the world creates more enemies than friends.

___ Trying to make deep changes in the way the world works is naive and dangerous.

___ As Americans, we have a responsibility to spread democracy around the world.

Center for Foreign Policy Development *Permission granted for duplication*

Policies to Consider

Rate each of the following approaches to U.S. foreign policy.

1 = Strongly Support
2 = Support
3 = Oppose
4 = Strongly Oppose
5 = Undecided

Economic:

___ Use boycotts and sanctions against all countries with poor human rights records.

___ Pressure our trading partners to eliminate restrictions against U.S. products.

___ Lead a major international effort to improve the economic situation in the republics of the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and the developing world.

___ Cut back foreign aid to concentrate on problems in the United States.

___ Limit foreign aid to our neighbors in Latin America.

___ Focus our foreign aid on poor democratic countries that have good human rights records.

___ Share our technology with other nations to cooperate on common problems, such as pollution.

___ Do business with all interested countries, regardless of their kind of government.

Military:

___ Defend countries that have oil or other raw materials that our country needs.

___ Sharply cut our military spending to provide funding for other problems.

___ Defend weak, democratic countries against their aggressive neighbors.

___ Supply arms to our friends to keep our enemies in check.

___ Maintain our status as the world's only remaining military superpower.

___ Organize a permanent, international military force to help maintain peace around the world.

___ Remove our troops from outside of North America.

___ Stop selling arms to developing nations.

Your Future Five

Instructions

You have now considered four possible Futures for the United States in the next ten years. You may particularly like one, you may like some of the points in all of them, or you may not like any. Here is your chance to choose what role you think the United States should play in the world in the years ahead. Your assignment is to craft a fifth Future of your own that explains what you think the United States should do in the next ten years.

What are your strongest beliefs about our future?

You should first consider your important beliefs about the United States and the problems facing us. Look over the beliefs listed on the "Focusing Your Thoughts" worksheet. Which beliefs do you strongly support or oppose? Were there any opinions raised in class that you strongly support or oppose? What other beliefs do you feel strongly about? Your title should summarize your position.

What policies would you like to see the United States pursue?

Now consider some of the policies you think the United States should carry out in the next ten years. Look over the policies listed on the "Focusing Your Thoughts" worksheet. Which policies do you strongly support or oppose? Were there other policies you heard in class that you strongly support or oppose? Can you think of anything else that you would like to see the United States do in the next ten years?

Now you are ready to complete "Your Future Five." As you do this, remember:

- *Address the major problems you see facing the United States.* If you feel that major problems threaten our country, these concerns should be addressed in your proposals for U.S. foreign policy. For example, if you feel that undemocratic countries threaten the United States, you must explain how you would deal with them.

- *Take everything you think is important into account.* If you think protecting the environment or making the world more stable is important, you should explain what steps the United States should take to accomplish your goal.

- *Be careful of contradictions.* Some policies contradict others. We cannot sharply cut our military spending and remain the world's leading military power at the same time. We cannot provide aid to a country and boycott its products at the same time. Keep in mind that policies should logically follow beliefs. It would not make sense to maintain all of our current alliances if we believe that we should refuse to ally with undemocratic governments.

- *Everything has its price.* Remember that big projects cost big money. You must consider the economic cost of your Future. For example, if you want the United States to have the world's strongest military and to try to end poverty in the United States and around the world, this will be very expensive. Would we pay for this Future by raising taxes or borrowing more money from other countries?

Finally, bear in mind that no Future you create will be perfect. Any important set of policies for the United States will have both supporters and critics. How would they respond to your Future? How would you answer your critics?

Good luck!

Name: _____

Your Future Five: _____

(your title)

1. What do you believe are the most important problems facing the United States?

2. What steps should the United States should take over the next ten years?

3. How would your Future affect the national budget?

4. What are the two strongest arguments opposing your Future?

   A.

   B.

5. What are the two strongest arguments supporting your Future?

   A.

   B.

Classroom Survey
Policies and Tradeoffs

The questions below are designed to gauge your ideas about three key aspects of U.S. foreign policy. By participating in this survey, you will be adding your voice to a nationwide poll of your peers that will be sent to presidential candidates and other policymakers.

Part I: *Select and circle from this list what you think are the three most urgent threats facing the U.S.*

1. Aggressive dictatorships.
2. One nation in a vital region getting too much power.
3. Conflicts in developing countries.
4. Conflicts in the former Soviet bloc.
5. Nuclear, biological and chemical weapons proliferation.
6. Loss of U.S. access to oil and other key resources abroad.
7. Social and economic problems at home.
8. Global problems such as environmental damage and AIDS.
9. Loss of economic competitiveness to Japan and other countries.
10. Terrorism.

Part II: *Policy decisions depend both on general priorities, and on specific circumstances. The following questions explore your priorities. They ask for what purpose, if any, you would support employing U.S. troops, or giving economic assistance. Check the most appropriate category in each case.*

1. Should the United States use military force (either independently or under UN auspices) for the following purposes?	*Usually/Always*	*Occasionally*	*Rarely/Never*
a. To defend democratic governments.	_____	_____	_____
b. To stop aggression against any state, whether democratic or not.	_____	_____	_____
c. To protect crucial U.S. interests overseas, such as access to oil.	_____	_____	_____
d. To protect civilians from brutality at the hands of their own governments.	_____	_____	_____
e. To defend U.S. territory from military attack.	_____	_____	_____

2. Should the United States give economic aid to foreign countries for the following purposes?	*Usually/Always*	*Occasionally*	*Rarely/Never*
a. To improve alliances with countries important to the U.S.	_____	_____	_____
b. To help the poorest people in developing countries.	_____	_____	_____
c. To reduce environmental damage in developing countries.	_____	_____	_____
d. To help those countries that are trying to build democratic institutions.	_____	_____	_____

Part III: *Here are four courses of action that the United States could pursue over the next ten years. Rank each course of action 1-4, assigning 1 to the statement with which you most agree and 4 to the statement with which you least agree.*

_____ 1. The United States should give top priority to promoting and protecting human rights and democracy in all countries, even if this antagonizes governments with which we have friendly relations.

_____ 2. The United States should give top priority to protecting its own interests abroad, even if this means supporting governments that are undemocratic and do not support human rights.

_____ 3. The United States should give top priority to working with other countries through the United Nations, even if we have to sacrifice some of our sovereignty (giving up the right, for instance, to use military force abroad without UN approval).

_____ 4. The United States should greatly reduce its military budget and give top priority to domestic issues and improving our economic competitiveness, even if our economic and military withdrawal from weak, unstable countries and regions might set the stage for more wars in those regions.

Name: _____ Grade level(s): _____ # of Students: _____

School: _____ Date: _____

Address: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Classroom Survey: Policies and Tradeoffs — Classroom Reporting Form

Part I: *Select and circle from this list what you think are the three most urgent threats facing the U.S.*

1. Aggressive dictatorships. _____
2. One nation in a vital region getting too much power. _____
3. Conflicts in developing countries. _____
4. Conflicts in the former Soviet bloc. _____
5. Nuclear, biological and chemical weapons proliferation. _____
6. Loss of U.S. access to oil and other key resources abroad. _____
7. Social and economic problems at home. _____
8. Global problems such as environmental damage and AIDS. _____
9. Loss of economic competitiveness to Japan and other countries. _____
10. Terrorism. _____

Part II: *Policy decisions depend both on general priorities, and on specific circumstances. The following questions explore your priorities. They ask for what purpose, if any, you would support employing U.S. troops, or giving economic assistance. Check the most appropriate category in each case.*

1. Should the United States use military force (either independently or under UN auspices) for the following purposes?	*Usually/Always*	*Occasionally*	*Rarely/Never*
a. To defend democratic governments.	_____	_____	_____
b. To stop aggression against any states, whether democratic or not.	_____	_____	_____
c. To protect crucial U.S. interests overseas, such as access to oil.	_____	_____	_____
d. To protect civilians from brutality at the hands of their own governments.	_____	_____	_____
e. To defend U.S. territory from military attack.	_____	_____	_____
2. Should the United States give economic aid to foreign countries for the following purposes?			
a. To improve alliances with countries important to the U.S.	_____	_____	_____
b. To help the poorest people in developing countries.	_____	_____	_____
c. To reduce environmental damage in developing countries.	_____	_____	_____
d. To help those countries that are trying to build democratic institutions.	_____	_____	_____

Part III: *Here are four courses of action that the United States could pursue over the next ten years. Rank each course of action 1-4, assigning 1 to the statement with which you most agree and 4 to the statement with which you least agree.*

1. The United States should give top priority to promoting and protecting human rights and democracy in all countries, even if this antagonizes governments with which we have friendly relations.
   1st____, 2nd____, 3rd____, 4th____.
2. The United States should give top priority to protecting its own interests abroad, even if this means supporting governments that are undemocratic and do not support human rights.
   1st____, 2nd____, 3rd____, 4th____.
3. The United States should give top priority to working with other countries through the United Nations, even if we have to sacrifice some of our sovereignty (giving up the right, for instance, to use military force abroad without UN approval).
   1st____, 2nd____, 3rd____, 4th____.
4. The United States should greatly reduce its military budget and give top priority to domestic issues and improving our economic competitiveness, even if our economic and military withdrawal from weak, unstable countries and regions might set the stage for more wars in those regions.
   1st____, 2nd____, 3rd____, 4th____.

To be included in the election year report, please return this form and student surveys by September 28, 1992, to the Choices Education Project, Center for Foreign Policy Development, Box 1948, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912. Please fill out your name and address if you wish to receive a copy of the report.

PUBLICATIONS LIST
CHOICES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Reproducible Units

GRADES 9-12
$8.00

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS: IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. POLICY

Global warming and ozone depletion have come to international attention in recent years, shifting environmental issues increasingly into the sphere of public policy. This one-week unit invites students to weigh the implications of global environmental problems in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy.

Revised August 1992; 40 pages/reproducible

GRADES 9-12
$8.00

U.S. BORDERS AND BEYOND

The United States is a nation of immigrants. Many Americans have questioned the values underlying the laws that decide who may now become an American. This one-week unit calls on students to examine the many facets of an issue that is fast becoming a key focus of U.S. foreign policy and has fueled the ongoing debate about our national identity.

Available October 1992; reproducible

GRADES 9-12
$8.00

COMING TO TERMS WITH POWER: U.S. CHOICES AFTER WORLD WAR II

The conclusion of World War II left the United States as the most powerful nation on earth, and yet the country was uneasy with its sudden prominence in world affairs. This one-week unit engages students in the national debate on the U.S. role in the world that gripped the United States in 1946-47. Students will explore the range of choices that challenged the country at one of its most critical historical junctures.

Available October 1992; reproducible

GRADES 9-12
$8.00

THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT: LOOKING FOR A LASTING PEACE

As U.S. policymakers take a fresh look at the prospects for peace between Arabs and Israelis, this two-week unit gives students an opportunity to see beyond the conventional two-dimensional framework of one of the world's most intractable problems and explore a wide-ranging set of options for U.S. foreign policy.

Revised April 1992; 55 pages/reproducible

GRADES 9-12
$8.00

FACING A DISINTEGRATED SOVIET UNION

The collapse of communism in the USSR and the establishment of independent republics did more to change U.S. foreign policy than any single event in decades. Students come away from this one-week unit with a clearer understanding of Soviet history, the Gorbachev era, and emerging issues in U.S. relations toward the former Soviet Union.

Revised January 1992; 45 pages/reproducible

GRADES 9-12
$8.00

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN A CHANGING WORLD

In recent years, far-reaching changes have taken place throughout the world. This one-week unit helps students consider the changes taking place in the international environment, weigh national priorities, and decide for themselves the direction that they think U.S. policy should take. The unit includes background reading that highlights three critical junctures in U.S. history, and a student survey.

Revised June 1992; 34 pages/reproducible

Textbooks

COLLEGE TEXT

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN A CHANGING WORLD: CHOICES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Dushkin Publishing Group, 1993

This college text uses the choices approach to consider the future direction of U.S. foreign policy. It includes a history of three critical junctures in U.S. history, consideration of the changing international environment, and examination of conflicting values in the formation of sustainable foreign policy.

Available late October 1992. Contact: Dushkin Publishing Group, Sluice Dock, Guilford, CT 06437. Tel: (800) 243-6532

GRADES 9-12
$5.00

IN THE SHADOW OF THE COLD WAR: THE CARIBBEAN AND CENTRAL AMERICA IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Center for Foreign Policy Development, 1991

This text examines the economic and political forces that have framed U.S. involvement in the Caribbean and Central America since the 1800s. The text incorporates ground-breaking research on the Cuban missile crisis and examines the view of the three countries involved. This two-week unit concludes with students analyzing future U.S. policy in the region.

61 pages. A Teacher's Resource Book ($5.00) is also available.

ORDER FORM

Make checks payable to:
Center for Foreign Policy Development

Return to: Choices Education Project
Center for Foreign Policy Development
Brown University, Box 1948
Providence, RI 02912

Name _____

School/Org. _____

Street _____

State _____ Zip _____

Please send me the following material:	**Price**	**Quantity**	**Subtotal**
Global Environmental Problems: Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy	$8.00		
U.S. Borders and Beyond (Available Oct. 1, 1992)	$8.00		
Coming to Terms with Power: U.S. Choices after World War II (Available Oct. 1, 1992)	$8.00		
The Arab-Israeli Conflict: Looking for a Lasting Peace	$8.00		
Facing a Disintegrated Soviet Union	$8.00		
The Role of the United States in a Changing World	$8.00		
In the Shadow of the Cold War: Textbook	$5.00		
In the Shadow of the Cold War: Teacher's Resource Book	$5.00		
	TOTAL:		

(A loose-leaf notebook will be included when you order three or more $8.00 reproducible units.)

CHOICES for the 21st Century Project
Center for Foreign Policy Development
Brown University, Box 1948
Providence, Rhode Island 02912

Address correction requested

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Providence, RI
Permit No. 202